

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

BARBARA ROBERTSHAW	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
GARY F. PUDLES, et al.	:	NO. 11-7353

MEMORANDUM

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff Barbara Robertshaw's Motion to Compel Enforcement of a Subpoena issued to Gold Gocial Gerstein, LLC, which is now known as G<sup>3</sup> of PA, LLC (Doc. 101) and the Respondent's Response and Cross Motion to Quash (Doc. 105). For the reasons set forth below, Plaintiff's Motion will be granted but is limited to include only documents provided to G<sup>3</sup> by Defendant Answernet, Inc. ("Answernet") from January 1, 2011 through the present.

**I. Discussion**

G<sup>3</sup> is a third-party to this action and was served with a subpoena by Plaintiff on July 13, 2012. This subpoena requested for production:

- (1) "All records which in any way memorialize or reflect any financial transaction by or involving Answernet, Inc. from January 1, 2007 through the present; including, without limitation all income records, invoices, payroll records, loan records, bank and/or investment records, stock sale and/or purchase records, asset acquisition and/or sales records, tax records, tax returns, financial statements, correspondence, email accounting reports, or other records reflecting any and all financial or tax transactions
- (2) "This request encompasses records in any and all forms, physical, digital, or other, and includes without limitation all written or digital database entries, notes, communications and/or other records."

While Plaintiff has shown the relevancy of certain tax returns and financial documents, the subpoena at issue is not narrowly tailored to obtain only those documents and, as such, is overly broad and unduly burdensome. The dispute between Plaintiff and AnswerNet is centered around a September 3, 2011 distribution and events subsequent thereto. Plaintiff's request for documents spanning a nearly six-year time period is far broader than the period at issue. Accordingly, and in reliance on the principle that broader restrictions on the scope of discovery apply when a non-party is targeted, Plaintiff's Motion to Compel is granted but limited in scope to include only documents provided to G<sup>3</sup> by AnswerNet from January 1, 2011 through the present.

An appropriate Order follows.

BY THE COURT:

**/s/ L. Felipe Restrepo**  
L. Felipe Restrepo  
United States Magistrate Judge